



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,386	03/07/2002	Koichi Emura	P22079	8736
7055 7590 02/12/2009 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				
EXAMINER VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P				
ART UNIT 2424		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/12/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/091,386

Applicant(s)

EMURA ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL VAN HANDEL

Art Unit

2424

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Van Handel.(3) Monica Ullaqaddi.(2) Bill Pieprz.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 40.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sezan et al. (US 2005/0060641).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner explained interpretation of Sezan et al. with respect to the "dynamically generates a preview that is a summary video" limitation. Applicant and examiner discussed differences between Applicant's invention and Sezan et al. Examiner suggested that language directed towards Applicant's function for displaying viewpoint options for composing the preview to a viewer for selection in a user interface may overcome the Sezan et al. reference.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424